



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_45381
Title of the Manuscript:	MOLECULAR VARIABILITY AND PHYLOGENETIC RELATIONSHIP AMONG Ocimum gratissimum L. ACCESSIONS USING RAPD MARKER
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>how did the authors rate the similarity if they did not obtain amplification for all genotypes ??? it can be seen in the photographs that there are no amplification products for the three genotypes, but only a few more amplifications occurred only in the case of 1 primer.</p> <p>was the DNA isolated in replicates ?? Was PCR carried out with repeats to check the correctness of amplification? in my opinion, the lack of amplification was due to the lack of primer-binding site and due to the presence of inhibitors of the reaction a tree drawn on the basis of 52 products is not reliable and should be confirmed with the bootstrap analysis.</p>	<p>how did the authors rate the similarity if they did not obtain amplification for all genotypes ??? it can be seen in the photographs that there are no amplification products for the three genotypes, but only a few more amplifications occurred only in the case of 1 primer.</p> <p>RESPONSE The genotypes were represented in all the wells of the plates showing amplification through the band scored for molecular statistical analysis.</p> <p>was the DNA isolated in replicates ??</p> <p>RESPONSE The isolated DNA from the genotypes was not in replicate. The best rep for each genotype was considered for each DNA isolation.</p> <p>Was PCR carried out with repeats to check the correctness of amplification?</p> <p>RESPONSE The PCR was carried out with repeat. Optimisation done for different primers considered before these three primers were considered and selected for amplification.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	research is valuable and brings new information about the analyzed species, but should be supplemented with more accurate RAPD analyzes for a more reliable test method, eg ISSR or SRAP	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	